

**REMARKS**

A Declaration by the present inventor is submitted herewith.

The informality of punctuation of Claims 10 and 11 has been addressed.

The Examiner is requested to review and reconsider all of the prior art he has cited, particularly Finnerty (US 3,680,237), Matthews (US 4,272,901), and Arnold (US 3,680,238) in light of the comments by the present inventor relating thereto, and the present amendment to the claims.

The claims have been amended, and significantly restricted in view of the prior art and for purposes of clarity.

It is respectfully submitted that combining Finnerty with Matthews, if it was feasible, would not yield the same result as that provided by the present 'cut-out means which is responsive to ambient light', which serves to utilize ambient daylight whenever possible for illuminating the screen indicia contents, to thereby significantly extend the useful service life of the phosphorescent screen.

It appears that the Examiner's comment concerning Claims 1, 5 and 6 and the changing of screen size as being a matter of mere obviousness are not well taken by the inventor: and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his conclusions and objections in regard thereto. The present inventor's comments and his expertise concerning the operation of electroluminescent lamps clearly removes this subject matter of increased screen size as being a mere matter of scale, or size difference.

. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finnerty (3,680,237) in view of Arnold (3,680,238), Johnson (3,404,474), Matthews (4,272,901) and Weiss et al (6,367,180)

Finnerty has internally located indicia, positioned within a sealed casing; Arnold relies upon

incandescent lights, which possess entirely different operating and illuminating characteristics from those of the present electroluminescent light source. The teachings of Matthews concerning operation at reduced voltage by the expedient of operating a number of incandescent lamps in series connection is shown by the present inventor to be wholly irrelevant to the subject electroluminescent lamp; and Weiss et al teach of disconnecting a power source in the presence of daylight solely for purposes of battery longevity. The references, both individually and collectively, lack any teaching to lead one skilled in the art in the direction of the present invention, or to make the suggested combination.

It is respectfully submitted that construction of the presented aggregation of references would have been impossible, in the absence of hindsight.

The present invention constitutes a valuable and unanticipated advance over the prior art, thereby making available a new, useful and safety-promoting display.

Consideration of the amended claims with a view to their allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Douglas W.EGGINS Regn No.21,175